

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending as of the office action mailed December 28, 2007.

Claims 1-9, 12, 15-16 are being amended. Support for the amendments can be found in at least pages 5-7 of the specification as filed.

New claims 17-25 are added. No new matter has been added. Support for the new claims can be found at least pages 5-7 of the specification as filed.

Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Applicant notes that the Examiner has not initialed all of the references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement Form 1449 dated May 27, 2004, a copy of which accompanied the office action. The Examiner did not articulate a reason for not initializing all the references. The Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner consider and initial the references in the Form 1449 that have not been already considered and initialed.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by Ebisawa (US 5,946,664). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite that the identification received from the video event display system includes "information identifying one or more of the video event display system or a user of the video event display system."

Ebisawa does not disclose nor suggest this claimed feature. Rather, the Examiner cites col. 2, lines 23-30 of Ebisawa as disclosing identifying the game program being executed. Ebisawa, however, does not disclose nor suggest the step of "receiving an identification from a video event display system, wherein the identification received from the video event display system comprises information identifying one or more of the video event display system or a

user of the video event system.” Thus, since the Examiner has not shown that Ebisawa anticipates claim 1 or is otherwise unpatentable, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8, and new claim 24, depend from claim 1, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above and for the independent subject matter recited in claims 2-8.

Claim 9. Claim 9 is amended to recite “receiving an identification from a video event display system, wherein the identification received from the video event display system comprises information identifying one or more of the video event display system or a user of the video event display system.” As stated above with respect to claim 1, Ebisawa does not disclose this step. Thus, since the Examiner has not shown that Ebisawa anticipates claim 9, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-15, and new claim 25, depend from claim 9, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above and for the independent subject matter recited in claims 10-15.

Claim 16. Claim 16 is amended to recite a “means for receiving an identification from a video event display system, wherein the identification received from the video event display system comprises information identifying one or more of the video event display system or a user of the video event display system.” As stated above with respect to claim 1, Ebisawa does not disclose this step. Thus, since the Examiner has not shown that Ebisawa anticipates claim 16, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 17. New claim 17 recites a system that includes instructions to, in part, “receive an identification from a video event display system, wherein the identification received from the video event display system comprises information identifying one or more of the video event display system or a user of the video event display system.” As stated above with respect to claim 1, Ebisawa does not disclose this step. Thus, since the Examiner has not shown that Ebisawa anticipates claim 17, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 18-23 depend from claim 17, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above and for the independent subject matter recited in claims 18-22.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

The fee of \$460 for excess claim fees and the fee in the amount of \$120 for the Petition for Extension of Time are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 28 April 2008

Andrew H. Leung
Andrew H. Leung
Reg. No. 55,374

Customer No.: 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071